



**Roskilde
University**

Narratives in talk-in-interaction

Organization and construction of cultural identities

Kjærbeck, Susanne

Published in:
The Consequences of Mobility

Publication date:
2005

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Kjærbeck, S. (2005). Narratives in talk-in-interaction: Organization and construction of cultural identities. In P. Bent, H. Haberland, A. Fabricius, S. Kjaerbeck, & K. Risager (Eds.), *The Consequences of Mobility: Linguistic and Sociocultural Contact Zones* (pp. 45-57). Roskilde Universitet.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Susanne Kjærbeck: Narratives in talk-in-interaction: organization and construction of cultural identities
in: Bent Preisler, Anne Fabricius, Hartmut Haberland, Susanne Kjærbeck, and Karen Risager eds.
The Consequences of Mobility
Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture
45-57
ISBN: 87-7349-651-0
<http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/mobility/>
© Susanne Kjærbeck and the Editors, 2005

Narratives in talk-in-interaction: organization and construction of cultural identities.

Susanne Kjærbeck

Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture, Roskilde, Denmark
susannek@ruc.dk

Abstract

This paper takes its point of departure in material which was established as part of the European research project INES, International Negotiations in Spanish: linguistic and cultural issues, in which researchers participated from the business school ESADE (Barcelona), Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, and Copenhagen Business School/Roskilde University. The objectives of the INES project were to study the language of negotiations as well as the cultural aspects of this activity type and of the international business community in Spain. The empirical part of the project is composed of focus groups, individual interviews, and simulated negotiations; all of the material was videotaped. In our focus group material, a salient communicative resource is the narrative. In this article, I want to look into the narratives used in the focus group interaction, and specifically within a culturally mixed group of business people operating in the Barcelona area.

In all the focus groups the language used was Spanish. Nine invited persons participated in culturally mixed group: DT from Sweden, IT supporter in an editorial; PC from Spain, manager in a consultant firm dealing with communication and PR; TH from New Zealand, manager in a bureau for translation; PD from Spain, department manager in RAC; JJ from Brazil, department manager in Nestle; LD from Russia, sales manager in a production company of building materials; CC from Italy, chief accountant in Pirelli; AC from Spain, engineer in a chromium-plating plant, JCB from Spain, sales manager in a production company of building materials. Moreover, a moderator of Spanish descent and two assistants were present. The topics of the focus group talk were, in accordance with the interests of the INES project, international negotiations and business in Spain.

I will focus on three aspects of the analyzed narratives: the organization of narratives; argumentational aspects, and the construction of identities.

Focus groups as a method for studying social organization

The objective of inviting a certain social or cultural group as participants in a focus group session is to get insight in the viewpoints and experiences of the specific group. At the same time, the conversation is meant to be 'focused', because the organizers have already decided the topics to be discussed. The moderator opens and closes topics, and he/she asks questions which should be

answered by the invited participants. But in spite of this management of the conversation, the method is seen as providing an extraordinary insight in the participants' knowledge, beliefs and motivations. The reason why focus groups are especially suited for giving this type of insight is the fact that they are performed as social interaction in the group, and through interaction the participants show each other and the research group how they structure and organize their social world (Hughes and Dumont, 1993). Nevertheless, it seems important to be aware of situational factors, which makes every interaction special – for example the local developments of the talk and the influence of the researchers in a specific situation.

In our case, the moderator was very conscious of making room for unregulated talk between the participants. This is particularly important when the idea is to use focus group data for studying cultural aspects. The focus group can only give access to the language and the concepts participants use to structure their social world, if they are given room to speak. Hughes and Dumont (1993: 776) see this method as a phenomenological approach to cultural analysis:

'In their reliance on social interaction, focus groups can also help researchers identify cultural knowledge that is shared among group members as well as to appreciate the range of different experiences individuals within a group may have. Each of these brings researchers closer to a phenomenological understanding of a cultural group'.

And in this search for the participants' perspective narratives seem to be a very useful communicative resource, as a sense making form which expresses the speaker's interpretation of events and experiences. In the extensive literature on narratives, it is shown how people make sense of their experiences through narratives (see Mishler, 1986; Polkinghorne, 1988; Bruner, 1990; Czarniawska, 1997 and 1998).

What is a narrative in talk-in-interaction?

Within the field of talk in interaction there is a wide literature on the analysis of conversational story-telling, I am here referring to the work carried out by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (e.g. Sacks 1974, 1992; Jefferson, 1978). This literature has focused on the special management of the turn taking system, which occurs in story-telling, on the sequential organization of the talk which precedes the story-telling and the talk which follows, and on the topical relation between the story eliciting talk, the story unit, and the subsequent talk

The interactional narratives in our material do have a series of features in common with the conversational story:

A story is articulated with ongoing talk. It must be 1: introduced into conversation, and 2: exited in such a way as to reengage or fit with other topical talk (Jefferson, 1978; Maynard 1988).

The story is a way of packaging or presenting the facts of one's own or another's/others' experience.

Story-telling is an interactional accomplishment, it is sequentially organized, and the recipients are an active part in the story-telling activity (Sacks, 1974; Jefferson, 1978)

Stories take more than one utterance at talk, and during the story-telling the primary speaker has the right and obligation to keep the turn until the completion of the story.

During the telling of a story the recipient(s) must: refrain from taking a turn except to make remarks demonstrating that the story is being followed and understood or asking questions that relate directly to what is being told; at the end of the telling, demonstrate understanding by for example making comments demonstrating that the story has been understood, or by undertaking to tell a next story (Polanyi, 1987; Sacks, 1974)

In the story there is a recognizable punch line, and very often a prototypical display of story completion, a return 'home' (Jefferson, 1978; Sacks, 1974 and 1992). After the completion of the story and if the recipient's talk is not produced, the teller can do different kinds of work in order to elicit participation from the recipient (can produce a secondary ending, an assessment, request the recipient's comment).

The relationship of a story to subsequent talk is negotiated between the teller and the recipients.

In my data, all the above mentioned features are shared, but what distinguishes the narratives, I have here, from the story (in CA-terms, this also counts for Polanyi and Quasthoff) are the following:

the telling of a general story, and not of a specific event. The narrative is presented as a personal experience which can be generalized, the repetitive experience which one can have over and over again.

following the general story, an opinion or moral is extracted from the story. This opinion segment seems to be a systematic element in the narrative, and this is what makes it an argumentational unit.

Based on action analysis, and due to the organizational systematicity of the narratives, 'narrative' is suggested as a denomination, which covers the whole package, including the three mentioned elements, and not just the general story, the stretch of talk which is completed with the production of the 'punch line' of the story (for the notion of 'punch line' see Sacks, 1992: vol II, pp.478-483). This implies that the element opinion/moral is treated as part of the unit, and not as "subsequent talk" as it usually is in the conversation analytic tradition, which focuses on the organization of turn-taking.

In the following, I will analyze two examples of narratives. First, I will analyze the organization of the narratives, and then I will look into the construction of cultural identities which takes place.

Organization of the narrative

The first narrative is produced by the Swedish person DT; it can be found in the transcript of narrative 1 in the appendix, line 6-30.

This narrative relates to previous viewpoints of the Russian, LD, and the New Zealander, TH, which sustain that cultural differences do not exist. The content of the narrative is anticipated by DT's objection 'don't don't tell me there are no cultural differences' in line 1, and by producing a

narrative, the speaker is here accounting for his disagreement. What follows is a narrative about cultural differences between Spanish and Swedish behavior when these groups go to a bar together.

Narrative 1:

The story entry device of this narrative is expressed in line 6-7: 'I don't know I know for example the Swedes who live here (.) that is not in negotiation but in general'. By initiating his turn with 'I don't know' DT formats his talk as a mitigated disagreement with the viewpoint expressed by LD in the previous turn. And by expressing his lack of knowledge, and in this case his lack of recognition, and contrasting it with an expression of knowledge 'I know for example the Swedes who live here...' the topic of 'the Swedes who live here' is introduced as a relevant topic to the previous talk. Moreover, through the formulation 'that is not in negotiation but in general' the introduced topic and the subsequent talk is related to the more general themes of the conversation, namely business negotiations and cultural differences. This entry device links the talk to be produced with other topical talk, but it does not project the story format as such. Different communicative activities and formats could follow this introduction.

The general story is produced in line 7-26, where the punch line is to be found in line 9: 'They don't even know how to pay because someone always gets ahead' and this punch line is extended and explained in line 11-15 'so so they think hey how generous right how good right and they don't understand'. This climax is reacted to by the recipients who laugh loudly and comment on the story in line 16-21. We have here a funny story. It is proposed as such by the speaker who highlights the funny part by displaying and explaining the cultural misunderstanding and by laughing himself in line 17-19.

After the punch line the teller DT continues the turn in the format of an assessment, but in reality he connects with the general story again, and continues the story in a very vivid way.

The consequences in the form of the opinion or moral of the general story follows in 28-30: 'so one way or the other you have you have you have to adapt (0.6) and (1.0) pay so to speak run and pay before all the others (0.5) to be on good terms (0.7) that is (0.6) it is it is very difficult to adapt to this because in addition you are not aware'.

The next narrative, narrative 2 in the appendix is produced by the Spanish person PC. PC's narrative is formatted as an answer to the moderator's question 'another difference', which is asked in the previous turn. The theme of the narrative is again misunderstandings in the intercultural encounter, specifically the role of the personal relationship in business.

Narrative 2:

PC's story entry device takes place in line 1-4: 'what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality (1.1) be it authentic or: or: a mask or invented so to speak (0.5) but hospitality in the sense that (0.5) eh::'. The story entry device highlights the theme of the story to be produced. It is not necessarily a story that follows, but in one way or the other the foreign managers' surprise of Spanish hospitality has to be explained, and that requires a longer stretch of talk. The story entry device is formatted as the first part of an answer to the question asked by the moderator in the previous turn and thereby it relates the subsequent talk the topic of the question.

The first part of the general story can be found in line 4-8: 'groups who come here you show up you fetch them you entertain them you this and that (0.7) if it is for two or three days (he laughs) it is something pom pom pom pom pom that is you treat them wonderfully'. The first part of the general story is followed by accounts for the explained behavior (line 8-14). And then, in line 15-18 the teller continues his general story, and produces so to speak the second part of it: 'I: well I have had many cases where thereafter they leave and they leave feeling kind of surprises right like (.) my God what people so they start something like writing letters (.) and they want sort of stay in contact (.) and they call and so on but well you are not really interested any more'. This second part of the general story is again followed by accounting (line 24-33), and by different kinds of participation from the recipients in the form of laughter and comments.

In line 35-38 the punch line of the general story is recycled again, in a very highlighted and entertaining way. This repetition was apparently elicited by the very loud laughter immediately before.

In line 46-50 a real story in the conversation analytical sense of the term is integrated into a long narrative. This new version of the point was probably also elicited by the loud and shared laughter of the recipients. It consists in the telling of a specific event, and here it exemplifies the general story which was produced and repeated immediately before: 'a while ago I had a group of managers here from different countries and mh: of course we did our utmost for them they came to Barcelona they wanted to know things see restaurants ..hh so we did our utmost for them (.) and afterwards the reply has been letters calls I don't know (.) I thought my God I cannot attend all'.

In line 50-59 we find a last recycling of the course of events of the stories already told. It is about another specific event, and it is framed as another concrete example of the general story. The point of the previously told stories is here repeated for the fourth time: 'I have eh: girls: from: eh: people from Japanese firms whom I met in Japan (0.5) maybe: 15 or 12 years ago (.) and they still write to me on me they write to me on my birthday they call me on my Saints day xx I don't know what they send me a photo from their wedding that is xxx like: hh.. it is enough but I I I cannot'.

In line 59-63 we find the opinion or moral of the total telling of the narrative: 'I really think in this we are we sin a little: (0.9) eh: I would not say we fake because when they are here we devote ourselves (0.7) but we devote ourselves eh: superficially and (hands: klap klap klap) to other things afterwards (.) that is you cannot devote yourself to to to: 500 persons (.) for a limited time yes (.) not for not for: ever'.

Construction of cultural identities

This culturally mixed group is characterized by a lot of negotiation between the participants about the involved identities. There is a constant negotiation about cultural commonality with reference to the shared experience as members of the international business environment in Spain, and at the same time a constant negotiation about cultural differences.

What is central in the narratives, in more analytical terms, is the suggested membership categories (mainly cultural groups) and their category bound activities and the positioning of the teller and the other participants in relation to the suggested categories or cultural groups. The negotiations about membership categories and positionings take place as well in the narratives as in the talk after the

narratives, where the other participants reject or accept the proposed categories and positionings. They can be supported, questioned, or explicitly challenged by the rest of the group.

Sacks, in his early work on membership categorization (1992) points to the existence and analysis of 'category-bound activities'. What is accomplished and emphasized by using the generic narrative form, is precisely the generalizability of the told experiences – the teller says: I have experienced this behaviour over and over again, and I believe this behaviour is bound to a certain cultural group. In the narratives analyzed, a certain kind of behavior is ascribed to the different cultural groups, e.g. 'the Swedes don't pay the bill when they go to a bar with Spaniards' or 'the Spaniards are great hosts, but they do not understand the personalization of the business contact as a sign of personal friendship, as the foreign business people do'.

In the narratives, the recipients' reactions after the completion of the narrative, show how they treat the proposed culturally generalizable experiences. At this place, next speakers question or support the proposed categorization of activities. In the first narrative, their objections imply that the cultural generalizability proposed by DT is not possible. In the next turn CC, an Italian business man says: " a mí me pasó esto en Suecia (.)", This happened to me in Sweden!! Thereby completely rejecting the DT's interpretation.

In the case of PC's narrative, the moral focuses on the theme of making friends, the social phenomenon of 'amiguismo' in Spain, and how this behavior causes misunderstandings in the intercultural meeting between managers. The question which is highlighted is: are we (the Spaniards) true or false friends, and the speaker concludes that to some extent the Spanish behavior is a false one. The next speakers connect to this question, and in doing this, they continue using the suggested membership categories Spaniards/foreigners and the positioning of the groups is to a large degree accepted - most explicitly by the Spaniards.

However, the construction of cultural identity seems to take place on two levels. On one level, the participants debate and verbalize explicitly their experiences with regard to different cultural groups. On the other level of the talk, they use more subtle forms of communication, such as laugh tokens and other kinds of micro level procedures/resources, thereby positioning themselves in relation to the ongoing talk and in relation to the other participants. These two levels of identity construction, seem to consist of complementary and highly coordinated procedures for interpersonal construction of identity.

Zimmerman (1998) works with three types of identities, which integrates identity construction on different levels of talk in accordance with the local moment-by-moment organization of interaction: 'Discourse identities' are assumed as participants engage in sequentially organized activities such as: story teller, story recipient, questioner, answerer. 'Situated identities' are 'brought into being and sustained by participants engaging in activities and respecting agendas that display an orientation to, and an alignment of, particular identity sets', for example caller and call-taker. 'Transportable identities' which 'travel with individuals across situations and are potentially relevant in and for any situation and in and for any spate of interaction' (p. 90-91), could be any physical or culturally based visible indicators of identity, which are made relevant in the interaction. Zimmerman makes the point that also situational and transportable identities are constructed through micro-level procedures.

In DT's and PC's narratives, it would be difficult to differentiate situational identities from transportable identities. The participants are constantly making cultural identities of themselves and others relevant in the talk, they are constructing an intercultural encounter, just as they were asked to by the researchers. In that way they are at the same time constructing their situational identities as focus group participants or interviewees. And they are doing it through the communicative resources at the micro-level as the following:

1. The teller automatically reveals his or her relationship to the cultural groups of the narrative by giving linguistic form to it. In the case of the Swedish speaker, DT, he carefully marks himself as a person who has certain insights and who does not identify with neither the Swedes nor the Spaniards of the narrative: 'I know for example the Swedes who live here ... they meet with Spaniards and ...' (line 6-7). He positions himself as a borderline member, he tends to see himself as a cultural mediator.

In the case of the Spanish speaker, PC, he does not position himself outside the established membership groups, on the contrary, he includes himself in the Spanish group of the narrative: 'what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality' (line 1-2).

2. Laughter under the production of the narrative is another method for showing alignment or disalignment with the cultural groups being presented, and with the participating persons of the conversation.

In the case of the Spanish speaker, PC, the narrative is told from a Spanish perspective, and the Spanish contingent of the group finds the laughable peaks of the narrative very amusing, and they laugh very loudly, while the foreigners of the group, for example the Swede DT who plays an active part in the beginning, does not participate in the laughter as the telling recycles and the laughables tend to be more at the expense of the 'foreigners' of the narrative. In relation to line 38 where PC says 'and they think something like I have a friend in Spain and no it's a lie they have nothing', DT does not participate in the laughter, he does not react at all. It is not a unambiguous interpretation though, because another foreigner, the Russian business man, does participate with a long, braying laughter. But it obviously does not have the same heartfelt and intense quality as the laughter of the Spanish recipients. In the case of PC's narrative, he as a teller marks the Spanish group of the talk as an ingroup and the foreign group as an outgroup, the laughter in the beginning of the unit indicates alignment across the cultural backgrounds of the participants, but as the narrative develops, alignment predominantly occurs between the Spanish participants. Similar phenomena can be found in DT's narrative, and in other narratives of the material.

Interactional narratives as an argumentational resource

As an argumentational resource the narrative seems to be especially important to the debate of the group. In the focus group setting, it is characteristic that the participants try to reach agreement about the issues under debate (Myers, 1998), and the narrative seems to be decisive as a tool for coordinating or aligning the different opinions and experiences of the participants. Because it contains a whole package, it offers a sort of connection or link between experiences, opinions and frames of understanding, and the narrative sets the agenda of the talk for a long time. And because a specific frame of understanding is proposed in this format, it does much more work than a simple statement.

Conclusion

In this paper I have looked into narratives found in focus group talk between nine business people of mixed cultural background, and tried to show my observations on two examples of interactional narratives. My main conclusions are the following:

Organization of the narrative as argumentational unit

It is suggested that the narrative is a unit, which contains a story entry device, a general story which presents the teller's repetitive experience, and an opinion or a moral, which is extracted from the general story.

As for stories, the interactional narrative is a collaborative production in which the teller and the recipients play an active part, but what differentiates the interactional narrative from a conversational story is the generalizability of the narrated experience and its integration into an argumentational unit.

The general story of the unit functions as evidence for the proposition, which is expressed as an opinion or a moral. In the case of the first narrative, the whole unit moreover functions as an account for a previously uttered disagreement.

Due to fact that the general story indicates personal experience, it cannot be questioned or rejected. What can be questioned in the following turns is the acceptability of the proposed opinion or moral and its generalizability of the told activities.

Identity aspects of the narrative

Identity is an issue which is constantly negotiated in this talk. The participants express explicitly their experiences and definitions of relevant cultural groups, thereby positioning themselves and the other participants in relation to the proposed identity groups. But the recipients of the narratives are also doing identity work, through the construction of alignment and disalignment in the talk – be it during the telling of the narrative or in their reactions to it after the narrative is completed. In the narratives analyzed, the respective cultural backgrounds of the participants are clearly reflected in their ways of contributing to the construction of discourse identities and transportable/cultural identities.

An interesting question is: To which extent can we speak of specific narrative methods for constructing identities? I believe that the micro level resources I have mentioned in the analysis can all be used in other communicative forms than the narrative. But the narrative format seems to be especially fitted for expressing temporal order and plot, and generic narratives are especially fitted for presenting category-bound activities, for example in relation to cultural categories.

Without doubt, narratives are an important communicative resource for organizing the world and its experiences for the participating group of international business people. But in relation to the cultural categorizations which take place in narratives, there seems to be a dilemma: we make sense by categorizing, but nobody likes to be categorized, at least not by cultural stereotypes – especially not if they are negative stereotypes.

Appendix

Narrative 1

DT: no no me digas que no hay diferencias culturales

don't don't tell me that there are no cultural differences

TH: ah bueno [no yo entendí otra casa tam]bién=

oh well no I understood it differently too

3. DT: [heh heh heh heh]

heh heh heh heh

4. LD: =de[pende de nivel de:] capa de: (0.8) ciudad (0.6)

it depends on:: social:: town

5. PD: social=

group

6. DT: =no sé yo sé por ejemplo los suecos que viven a↑quí, (.) o sea no para negociar

I don't know I know for example the Swedes who live here that is not in negotiation

7. pero en general, (0.5) se encuentran con españoles, y entonces van al ↑bar, (1.1)

but in general they meet with Spaniards and then they go to a bar

8. Y: ehm (0.7) y nunca pagan. (1.3) nunca pagan en el ↑bar, (.) no porque no quieran

AND: ehm and they never pay they never pay in a bar not because they don't want

9. pagar, porque (.) no saben ni cómo pa↑gar porque siempre se adelanta al↓guien.

to pay because they don't even know how to pay because someone always gets ahead

10. (): (0.7) huh huh [huh]

huh huh huh

11. DT: [entonces] entonces [creen huy] qué generosos ↑no? ((smiles))

then then they think hey how generous right

12. (): [hm m] ((cough))

hm m

13. DT: qué bien ↑no

how good right

14. LD: hmpf hhh.. hhh.. ((laughter))=

hmpf hhh.. hhh..

15. DT: =y no entienden y [y:]

and they don't understand and and:

16. LD: [yo ()] () [igual]

I () () the same

17. DT: [hah]

hah

18. (): [hhhhhhh]

hhhhhhh

19. DT: [hah hah]

hah hah

20. (): [hhhh] hhh..

hhhh hhh..

21. LD: no pagan [nada no]

they don't pay anything no

22. DT: [es horrible] porque entonces no sabes (.) cómo tienes que actuar. (0.8) no tienes

23. *it is terrible because then you don't know how to behave* *you don't have*
ni idea. (.) y no sabes tampoco porque la () la gente te está empezando a mirar
the slightest idea and nor do you know because people are beginning to dislike you
24. *↑mal*, (0.7) y te están considerando un *rác*ano, ((smiles)) (1.0)
and they consider you a slacker
25. (): hh.. heh [heh heh]
hh.. heh heh heh
26. DT: [y por *qué*] no paga nunca *↑ese*,
and why does that one never pay
27. JCB: hm hm ((cough)) (1.3)
hm hm
28. DT: entonces tienes tienes tienes de alguna forma que adaptarte (0.6) *Y* (1.0) pagar
so one way or another you have you have you have to adapt AND pay
29. digamos ir *corriendo* a pagar antes de todo el *↑mun↓do* (0.5) para quedar bien (0.7)
so to speak run and pay before all the others to be on good terms
30. o sea, (0.6) es es muy *difícil* adaptarse a *esto* porque además no se *nota*, (0.6)
that is it is very difficult to adapt to this because in addition you are not aware

Narrative 2

PC: yo lo que veo que les sorprende bastante a a: gente:: ejecutivos compañeros
what I see is that it surprises to a great extent people:: fellow managers

extranjeros que vienen a España un poco creo que es nuestra hospitali↓dad.
from other countries who come to Spain I somehow think it is our hospitality
(1.1) ya sea auténtica o: o: como máscara o fingida digamos. (0.5) pero
be it authentic or: or: as a mask or invented so to speak but
hospitalidad en el sentido de que, (0.5) eh:: grupos que vienen a↓*quí* *llegas*
hospitality in the sense that eh:: groups who come here you show up
los *acoges* los *sacas* los *traes* los *enseñas* los *diviertes*
you fetch them you take them out you bring them you show them you entertain them
los tal y tal? (0.7) si es para dos días o tres días eh hh.. [heh heh heh es algo] (.)
you this and that if it is for two or three days eh hh.. heh heh heh it is something

7. JCB: [hah hah hah hah]
hah hah hah hah

8. PC: pom pom pom pom *↑pom* o sea los tratas de maravilla porque realmente
pom pom pom pom pom that is you really treat them wonderfully
creo que nos sale del carácter si vienen aquí (0.7) [un]
I really think this is our character if they come here

10. DT: [hm] ((cough))
hm

11. PC: poco *pasear*los *enseñar*les yo creo que nos gusta además nos divierte a nosotros
take them out a little show them furthermore I think we like it we are entertained

12. [Y:]

AND:

13. DT: [hay *un*] orgullo de [ser de ↓*aquí* de enseñarles]
there is a pride of being from here of showing them

14. las cosas=

the things

15. PC: =claro y yo: pues he tenido muchos casos de que luego se van y se van como
of course and I: well I have had many cases where thereafter they leave and they leave
16. sorprendidos no, como (.) Dios mío que gente entonces empiezan como escribir cartas
feeling kind of surprised right like my God what people so they start something like writing letters
17. (.) y *quieren como mantener el contacto* (.) y *llaman y tal pero bueno y tú como que*
and they want sort of stay in contact and they call and so on but well and you
18. *ya no estás interesado.* (.)
and you are not really interested any more
19. LD: *heh heh* [heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh heh heh
20. DT: [hah hah hah hah]
hah hah hah hah
21. AC: [hah hah hah hah hhah] [hah hah]
hah hah hah hah hhah hah hah
22. PC: [tengo que]
I have to
23. AC: *hah hah hah* ()=
hah hah hah
24. PC: =*exacto ya los he pa↓sea↑do y se han ↓i↑do*
exactly I have already taken them out and they are gone
25. DT: *cumplido*=
done
26. PC: =*mira ya* [vien]
look others
27. DT: [()] *te escriben*
() they write to you
28. PC: *exacto vienen otro[s, dentro de dos sema↑nas]*
exactly others come already within two weeks
29. D: [hhihh hihh hihh ..hh]
hihh hihh hihh ..hh
30. AC: [heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh
31. PC: *no estoy para atender a todo el mundo o↓ye, [ya ya se]*
I cannot attend to the whole world listen they should already already
32. D: [hihh hihh hihh]
hihh hihh hihh
33. PC: *pueden dar por contentos*
be satisfied
34. AC: *hehh hehhh hehh hehh* [hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh]
hehh hehhh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh hehh
35. PC: [los pobres quedan como agrade]ci[dos no]
the poor creatures fell sort of grateful right
36. LD: [hehh] hehh hehh
hehh hehh hehh
37. [hehh]
hehh

38. PC: [y cre]en como tengo un amigo en España y no no mentira no tienen [nada ()]
and they think something like I have a friend in Spain and no no it's a lie they have
nothing ()
39. LD: °*[heh heh heh heh heh hh]*°
hah hah hah hah hah hah
40. (): [hah hah hah hh.. hh.]
hah hah hah hah hah
41. AC: [hah hah hah hah hah hah]¹
hah hah hah hah hah hah
42. PC: pero
but
43. LD: ..hh
..hh
44. PC: (es [un poco por esto) () (.) () no]
it is somehow due to this () () right
45. LD: [heh heh heh heh heh heh]
heh heh heh heh heh
46. PC: que hace poco he tenido aquí un grupo de ejecutivos de varios pa↑íses y
a while ago I had a group here of managers from different countries and
47. mh: claro nos hemos desvivido por ellos venían a Barcelona querían conocer
mh: of course we did our utmost for them they came to Barcelona they wanted to know
48. cosas querían ver restaurantes ..hh bien como que nos hemos desvivido por ellos (.)
things they wanted to see restaurants ..hh so we did our utmost for them
49. luego la respuesta ha sido de cArtas llamAdas no sé qué (.) yo pensaba Dios mío
and afterwards the reply has been letters calls I don't know what I thought my God
50. no puedo atenderlos a todos o sea y eso mh: me ha pasado es la: ten↑go (.) eh:
I can't attend all in other words and this mh: happened to me it is the I have eh:
51. chicas: de: eh: gente de empresas japonesas que conocí en Ja↑pón (0.5) hace como:
girls from eh people from Japanese firms whom I met in Japan maybe:
52. 15 años, o doce años, (.) y aún me escriben por mi por me me escriben por mi
15 or 12 years ago and they still write to me on me me they write to me on my
53. cumpleaños me lla[man por mi santo: () no sé qué me mandan una foto de la boda]
birthday they call me on my saint's day () I don't know they send me a photo from their wedding
54. AC: [hh.. hah hah hah hah hah hah hah]
hh.. hah hah hah hah hah hah hah
55. PC: o sea [() como:]
that is () like
56. (): [heh heh]
heh heh
57. PC: hh.. ya pero
hh.. it is enough but
58. (): huh huh [huh]
huh huh huh
59. PC: [n n] n:: no puedo, o sea realmente yo creo que en esto somos pecamos un
I I I cannot that is I really think in this we are we sin a

¹ In these lines, we have here massive laughter and it is impossible to differentiate all the voices. The video camera only covers some of the participants.

60. *poco de: (0.9) eh: no diría de falsos porque cuando están aquí nos damos, (0.7) pero*
 little eh: I would not say we fake because when they are here we devote ourselves but
61. *nos damos eh: superficialmente y klap klap klap ((with hands)) a otra cosa después (.)*
 we devote ourselves eh: superficially and klap klap klap to other things afterwards
62. *o sea no puedes darte a a a: 500 personas (.) por un período de tiempo limi↑ta↓do sí,*
 that is you cannot devote yourself to to to: 500 persons for a limited time yes
63. *(.) no por el: resto del tiempo*
 not for not for ever

Transcript notation

[xxx]	overlapping utterances
= =	adjacent utterances are latched, no interval between them
<u>xxx</u>	emphasis
°xxx°	quieter than the surrounding talk
↓ ↑	marked rising and falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
xxx	creaking voice
And	capitals mark extra volume
((laughs))	double parentheses: descriptions of phenomena which could not be registered in detail

References

- Asmuss, Birte and Kjærbeck, Susanne (forthcoming). Negotiating meaning in narratives: an investigation of the interactional construction of punchline and the post-punchline sequence. *Narrative Inquiry*.
- Hester, Stephen and Peter Eglin, eds. 1997. *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. Washington D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.
- Hughes, Diane and Kimberley DuMont 1993. Using Focus Groups to Facilitate Culturally Anchored Research. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 21:6, 775-807.
- Jefferson, Gail 1978. Sequential Aspects of Storytelling in Conversation, in Jim Schenkein, ed. *Studies in the organization of conversation*, 219-248.
- Jefferson, Gail 1985. An Exercise in the Transcription and Analysis of Laughter, in T.A.van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* 3, 25-34.
- Jefferson, Gail 1988. On the sequential Organization of Troubles-talk in Ordinary Conversation. *Social Problems* 35:4, 418-441.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne 2004. Historiefortælling i mundtlig kommunikation. Modtageren som medfortæller, in Susanne Kjærbeck, *Historiefortælling i praktisk kommunikation*. København: Samfundslitteratur, 141-170.
- Kjærbeck, Susanne 2001. "Nosotros los españoles" y "los de afuera": Un estudio de focus group sobre la identidad cultural y la formación de opinion. *Discurso y Sociedad* 3:1.
- Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky 1966. Narrative analysis: oral version of personal experience, in June Helm, ed. *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 12-44
- Maynard, Douglas 1988. Narratives and Narrative Structure in Plea Bargaining. *Law & Society Review* 22:3, 449-481.
- Myers, Greg 1998. Displaying opinions: Topics and disagreement in focus groups. *Language in Society* 27, 85-111.
- Polanyi, Livia 1985. Conversational Storytelling. In T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* 3, 183-201.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sacks, Harvey 1974. Analysis of the course of a joke's telling, in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer, eds. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 110-125.
- Sacks, Harvey 1992. *Lectures on Conversation* 1-2. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey 1972. On the Analyzability of Stories by Children, in John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York, 325-345.
- Zimmerman, Don H. 1998. Identity, Context and Interaction, in Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe, eds. *Identities in Talk*. Sage, 87-106.